

Appl. No.: 09/837,686
Amdt. dated March 11, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant received the Office Action dated December 22, 2003, in which the Examiner: (1) rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8, 15, 16, 18-22 and 24-29 as obvious in view of Davis (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,462) and Raasch et al. (US Patent No. 5,280, 283); and (2) objected to claims 7, 9-14, 17, 23, 30 and 31 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable. In this Response, Applicant amends claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 13-18, 20-21 and 24-25. Claims 1 and 3-31 are pending. Based on the arguments and amendments contained herein, Applicant believes all pending claims to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Claim 1 was amended to clarify that "scanner" refers to an "image" scanner. Amended claim 1, in part, requires "a keyboard connected to the image scanner via the image scanner's first port." The Examiner recognizes that Davis does not teach "a keyboard connected to the image scanner via the image scanner's first port" and cites Raasch as teaching this limitation (see Office Action pg. 2, item 2). However, Raasch does not teach an "image scanner" as required in claim 1. Instead, Raasch teaches a keyboard 112 connected to a "keyboard scanner" 108 that decodes which key of the keyboard 112 is pressed (see Fig. 1, Fig. 9, col. 3, lines 43-54, col. 8, line 49-col. 9, line 12). For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 and all claims that depend from claim 1 are allowable.

Claim 15 also was amended to refer to an "image" scanner. Amended claim 15, in part, now requires "connecting a keyboard to the image scanner via the communication bus, where the communication bus passes commands from the keyboard directly to the computer." For at least the reasons provided above, Applicant submits that claim 15 and all claims that depend from claim 15 are allowable.

Claim 26, in part, requires "a scanner element to scan a document" and "a first connection coupled to the control logic to which a user-activated input device can be connected." Neither Davis nor Raasch teaches or suggests a document

Appl. No.: 09/837,686
Amtd. dated March 11, 2004
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2003

scanner having "a first connection coupled to the control logic to which a user-activated input device can be connected" as required in claim 26. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that claim 26 and all claims that depend from claim 26 are allowable.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the prior art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

If any fees or time extensions are inadvertently omitted or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Hewlett-Packard Company Deposit Account Number 08-2025 and enter any time extension(s) necessary to prevent this case from being abandoned.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400